



Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts
Office of Communications, 455 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
California Courts Infoline 800-900-5980, www.courts.ca.gov

NEWS RELEASE

Contact: [Leanne Kozak](mailto:Leanne.Kozak@courts.ca.gov), 916-263-2838

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

September 28, 2012 (S.C. 39/12)

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions for Week of September 24, 2012

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The statement of the issue or issues in each case set out below does not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#12-100 *Paratransit, Inc. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd.*, S204221. (C063863; 206 Cal.App.4th 1319; Sacramento County Superior Court; 34200980000249.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in an action for writ of administrative mandate. This case presents the following issue: Did the trial court properly find that employee misconduct within the meaning of *Amador v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd.* (1984) 35 Cal.3d 671 disqualified a discharged employee from receiving unemployment insurance benefits?

#12-101 *People v. Almanza*, S204410. (E053366; 207 Cal.App.4th 269; Riverside County Superior Court; SWF10002663.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. McCullough*, S192513 (#11-80), which presents the following issue: Did defendant forfeit his claim that he was unable to pay the \$270.17 jail booking fee (Gov. Code, § 29550.2) imposed by the trial court at sentencing, because he failed to object at the time?

###